

MAY 05 2004
U.S. PATENT & TRADEMARK OFFICE

HJ/2841
IFW

Appl. No. 09/850,960
Brief
Brief following Appeal of 4 March 2004

Page 1 of 18

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK
OFFICE BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES

Appl. No. : 09/850,960
Appellant(s) : JACKSON, Andrew, et al.
Filed : 8 May 2001
Title : 150W-1000W MASTERCOLOR
CERAMIC METAL HALIDE LAMP
SERIES WITH COLOR TEMPERATURE
TC/A.U. : 2841
Examiner : PHAN, T. S.
Atty. Docket : PHUS 010247

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING OR
TRANSMISSION

I certify that this correspondence is
being:

☒ deposited with the U.S. Postal
Service with sufficient postage as
first-class mail in an envelope
addressed to:

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

☐ transmitted by facsimile to the
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office at
703-872-9318.

On: May 3, 2004

By: John C Fox

APPELLANT'S APPEAL BRIEF

Mail Stop Appeal Brief - Patents
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

BRIEF OF APPELLANT

05/13/2004 KJONES3 00000006 501850 09850960

01 FC:1402 330.00 DA This Brief of Appellant follows a Notice of Appeal,
dated 4 March 2004, appealing the final rejection of claims 1-
19 and 31-36 of the application, the final rejection dated 4
December 2003. All requisite fees set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(c)
for this Brief are hereby authorized to be charged to Deposit
Account No. 501850.

in (40,50), a Mo/alumina cermet (41,51) and a refractory electrode (4,5) including a coil (4c,5c).


Van Der Leeuw, like Krasko, discloses a quartz metal halide lamp, not a ceramic metal halide lamp. See, e.g., col. 5, line 29. Moreover, Van Der Leeuw shows a feedthrough assembly (see, e.g., Fig. 3) which includes a feedthrough of Mo wire connected to an electrode 15 of conventional design. See col. 5, line 46 and col. 6, lines 52, 53.

Accordingly, neither of the cited references teach or suggest, alone or in combination, a ceramic discharge lamp with a four-part feedthrough assembly, and claim 3 and its dependent claims 4-16 are patentable over Van Vliet in view of Van Der Leeuw. Accordingly, it is urged that the rejection is in error and should be reversed.

CONCLUSION

Accordingly, it is urged that each of the rejections is in error, and Appellant respectfully requests that the Board reverse the Examiner's final rejections.

Respectfully submitted,



John C. Fox, Reg. 24,975
Consulting Patent Attorney
203-329-6584